

### **REMARKS**

Claims 1-3, 8-12, 17, 18 and 21-25 are pending in this application. By this Amendment, claims 1, 3, 10 and 12 are amended to further clarify the display surface and incorporate most of the subject matter recited in original claims 4, 5, 13 and 14, respectively. New claims 21-24 are added incorporating most of the subject matter recited in original claims 1, 3, 6, 7, 10, 12, 15 and 16, respectively. New claim 25 is also added. Claims 4-7 and 13-16 are cancelled to avoid redundancy. No new matter is added. Reconsideration and prompt allowance of the pending claims is respectfully requested, at least in light of the following Remarks.

Entry of the amendments is proper under 37 CFR §1.116 because the amendments: (a) place the application in condition for allowance for the reasons discussed herein; (b) do not raise any new issue requiring further search and/or consideration; and (c) place the application in better form for appeal, should an appeal be necessary. Entry of the amendments is thus respectfully requested.

#### **I. Personal Interview**

Applicants appreciate the courtesies shown to Applicants' representative by Examiner Park in the March 3, 2010 personal interview. Applicants' separate record of the substance of the interview is incorporated into the following remarks.

#### **II. The Claims Define Patentable Subject Matter**

The Office Action rejects claims 1, 4, 6, 8, 10, 13, 15 and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 6,831,659 to Mukoyama et al. ("Mukoyama") in view of Botchy (*C Magazine* "Speed-up Techniques and Thinking Routine for 3D Games Found Source Code of a 3D Game 'Doom'", and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2003/0207704 to Takahashi et al. ("Takahashi"); and rejects claims 2, 3, 5, 7, 9, 11, 12, 14, 16 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Mukoyama in view of Botchy with Takahashi, and

further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0135603 to Nakagawa et al. ("Nakagawa"). The cancellation of claims 4-7 and 13-16 render the rejections of those claims moot. The rejections of the remaining claims is respectfully traversed.

None of the applied references, either alone or in combination, teach or render obvious each and every feature recited in claim 1. For example, none of the applied references, either alone or in combination, teach or render obvious "wherein a central part object included in the model object stands along a Y-axis, the Y-axis being an axis along a vertical direction, and the rest of the part objects are positioned apart from a central axis of the central part object; and rotating each of the part objects about the Y-axis based on rotational information of the virtual camera so that the display surface of each of the part objects is directed toward the virtual camera when the virtual camera rotates about the Y-axis while being directed toward the central part object," as recited in claim 1.

The Office Action asserts that the elements P of Mukayama correspond to the claimed part objects. However, Mukayama discloses that each element P rotates around a center point of that particular element P to face a representative vector point V1 (see Mukayama, Figs. 15 and 25 and col. 15, lines 3-14 and col. 17, lines 20-33). Thus, each element P of Mukayama rotates around its own an axis that intersects that particular element P. In contrast, the part objects of claim 1 are rotated "about the Y-axis" and are "positioned apart from a central axis of the central part object." In addition, the elements P Mukayama are flat objects that do not include "a three-dimensional projecting portion...extending at least in a direction perpendicular to the display surface," as recited in claims 1. Therefore, Mukayama fails to suggest or render obvious the part objects of claim 1. None of the rest of the applied references remedy the deficiency of Mukayama. Thus, claim 1 is patentable over the applied references.

Claims 3, 10 and 12 also recite "wherein a central part object included in the model object stands along a Y-axis, the Y-axis being an axis along a vertical direction, and the rest of the part objects are positioned apart from a central axis of the central part object; and rotating each of the part objects about the Y-axis based on rotational information of the virtual camera so that the display surface of each of the part objects is directed toward the virtual camera when the virtual camera rotates about the Y-axis while being directed toward the central part object" as well as "the part objects each having a display surface and being three-dimensional objects extending at least in a direction perpendicular to the display surface." Therefore, claims 3, 10 and 12 are patentable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above for claim 1 as well as for the additional features those claims recite.

Claims 2, 8, 9, 11, 17 and 18 depend from independent claims 1, 3, 10 and 12, respectively. Therefore, those dependent claims are also patentable at least for their dependence from claims 1, 3, 10 and 12, as well as for the additional features those claims recite.

Withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested.

### **III. New Claims**

New claims 21-25 are patentable over the applied references. For example, new claims 21-24 recite "wherein a central part object included in the model object stands along a Y-axis, the Y-axis being an axis along a vertical direction, and the rest of the part objects are positioned apart from a central axis of the column-shaped part object; rotating each of the part objects about an X-axis, which is perpendicular to the Y-axis, based on rotational information of the virtual camera so that a display surface of each of the part objects on which an image is drawn is directed toward the virtual camera when the virtual camera rotates about the X-axis while being directed toward the central part object." Therefore, claims 21-24 are patentable for reasons similar to those discussed above for claim 1.

Claim 25 depends from claim 1. Therefore, claim 25 is also patentable at least for its dependence from claim 1, as well as for the additional features claim 25 recites.

**IV. Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that this application is in condition for allowance. Favorable reconsideration and prompt allowance of the claims are earnestly solicited.

Should the Examiner believe that anything further would be desirable in order to place this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number set forth below.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Oliff  
Registration No. 27,075

Brian Kauffman  
Registration No. 63,199

JAO:BKK/jls

Attachments:  
Petition for Extension of Time  
Amendment Transmittal

Date: April 1, 2010

**OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC**  
**P.O. Box 320850**  
**Alexandria, Virginia 22320-4850**  
**Telephone: (703) 836-6400**

<p>DEPOSIT ACCOUNT USE AUTHORIZATION Please grant any extension necessary for entry of this filing; Charge any fee due to our Deposit Account No. 15-0461</p>
---